

How Much Should a 19th-Century French Bastard Inherit

Doron ZEILBERGER ¹

Dedicated to Gerry Ladas on his 60th Birthday.

Abstract: Catalan's formula, for the portion of the inheritance that a legitimate child of a 19th-century deceased French gentleman should receive, is given a new proof (using Difference Operators), and generalized. Another, more computationally efficient, formula is also derived.

Catalan's Formula

Chrystal's classical text[Ch] (II, p. 416) contains the following charming exercise, due to Catalan[Ca].

By French law an illegitimate child receives one-third of the portion of the inheritance that he would have received had he been legitimate. If there are l legitimate and n illegitimate children, show that the portion of inheritance 1 due to a legitimate child is

$$\frac{1}{l} - \frac{n}{3l(l+1)} + \frac{n(n-1)}{3^2l(l+1)(l+2)} - \dots \pm \frac{n(n-1)\dots 2.1}{3^nl(l+1)\dots(l+n)} \quad .$$

Let's call the portion due to a legitimate child $a(l, n)$. If the condition would have been that each illegitimate child receives one-third of what a legitimate child is to receive, this would have yielded the simple algebraic equation $la(l, n) + n(1/3)a(l, n) = 1$ and hence $a(l, n) = 3/(3l + n)$. But since the bastard is to receive one-third of *what he would have received had he been legitimate*, we have a *difference* (or recurrence) equation:

$$la(l, n) + (n/3)a(l+1, n-1) = 1 \quad . \quad (*)$$

Introducing the shift operators $Lf(l, n) := f(l+1, n)$ and $Nf(l, n) = f(l, n+1)$, this can be rewritten:

$$(1 + \frac{n}{3l}LN^{-1})a(l, n) = \frac{1}{l} \quad ,$$

yielding:

$$\begin{aligned} a(l, n) &= (1 + \frac{n}{3l}LN^{-1})^{-1} \frac{1}{l} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-\frac{n}{3l}LN^{-1})^r \frac{1}{l} \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-1)^r \left(\frac{n}{3l} \frac{n-1}{3(l+1)} \dots \frac{n-r+1}{3(l+r-1)} L^r N^{-r} \right) \frac{1}{l} = \sum_{r=0}^n \frac{(-1)^r n(n-1)\dots(n-r+1)}{3^rl(l+1)\dots(l+r)} \quad .\square \end{aligned}$$

¹ Department of Mathematics, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, USA. zeilberg@math.temple.edu ; <http://www.math.temple.edu/~zeilberg> . Supported in part by the NSF. Feb. 6, 1997.

Another Formula

While Catalan's formula is elegant, it is not any better than using the recurrence (*) directly, by starting with $a(l+n, 0) = 1/(l+n)$ and successively computing $a(l+n-1, 1)$, $a(l+n-2, 2), \dots, a(l, n)$, requiring $O(n)$ operations and $O(1)$ storage. The recurrence (*) enables us to quickly find $a(n+1, l-1)$ or $a(n-1, l+1)$, once we know $a(n, l)$, in case the status of one of the children changes. However, neither the recurrence (*), nor Catalan's formula, are efficient if we have already computed $a(l, n)$, and all of a sudden another illegitimate child, that was previously unknown to the family, shows up at the lawyer's office. By using `zeillim` in the package `EKHAD` that accompanies [PWZ], we find the recurrence

$$a(l, n+1) = \frac{1}{l+n+1} + \frac{2(n+1)}{3(l+n+1)} a(l, n) \quad ,$$

that implies the alternative formula:

$$a(l, n) = \frac{n!(2/3)^n}{(n+l)!} \sum_{b=0}^n \frac{(l+b-1)!}{b!} (3/2)^b \quad .$$

The Multi-Mistress Case

A typical well-to-do 19th-century French gentleman must have had *plusieurs amantes*. It is very unlikely that he liked them equally well. Let's say that he had m of them, and he wished to leave to every one of the n_i children of Mistress i , x_i of what he would have left them had they been legitimate ($i = 1, \dots, m$). Suppose that he also had l legitimate children. What portion of the inheritance should each of these l legitimate children receive? Let's call this quantity $a(l; n_1, \dots, n_m)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n_i x_i}{l} L N_i^{-1}\right) a(l; n_1, \dots, n_m) &= \frac{1}{l} \quad , \quad \text{and hence} \\ a(l; n_1, \dots, n_m) &= \\ \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n_i x_i}{l} L N_i^{-1}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{l} &= \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_m \geq 0} (-1)^{r_1 + \dots + r_m} \frac{(r_1 + \dots + r_m)!}{r_1! \dots r_m!} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{x_j n_j}{l} L N_j^{-1} \right)^{r_j} \right) \frac{1}{l} \\ &= \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_m \geq 0} (-1)^{r_1 + \dots + r_m} \frac{(r_1 + \dots + r_m)!}{r_1! \dots r_m!} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m x_j^{r_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^m (n_j N_j^{-1})^{r_j} \right) ((1/l)L)^{r_1 + \dots + r_m} \frac{1}{l} \\ &= \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_m \geq 0} (-1)^{r_1 + \dots + r_m} \frac{(r_1 + \dots + r_m)!}{r_1! \dots r_m!} \frac{1}{(l)(l+1) \dots (l+r_1 + \dots + r_m)} \prod_{j=1}^m x_j^{r_j} \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{n_j!}{(n_j - r_j)!} \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$a(l; n_1, \dots, n_m) = \sum_{r_1=0}^{n_1} \dots \sum_{r_m=0}^{n_m} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^m (-x_j)^{r_j} \binom{n_j}{r_j}}{(1+r_1 + \dots + r_m) \binom{l+r_1 + \dots + r_m}{l-1}} \quad . \square$$

REFERENCES

[Ca] E.C. Catalan, *Nouv. Ann.*, ser. II, t.2.

[Ch] G. Chrystal, “*ALGEBRA*”, reprinted by Chelsea, New York, NY, 1964.

[PWZ] M. Petkovsek, H.S. Wilf, and D. Zeilberger, “*A=B*”, A.K.Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1996. The accompanying Maple package EKHAD may be downloaded from the author’s website.